DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 541 SP 032 223

AUTHOR Muir, Sharon Pray; Leslie, Susan C.
TITLE Non-Academic Criteria: Accountability in Pre-Service Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, March 28-31, 1990). Some text in the appendices may not reproduce well because of broken type.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Admission Criteria; Counseling; Ethics; Higher Education; Hygiene; Legal Problems; Personality Traits; Physical Health; *Student Attrition; *Student Behavior; *Student Characteristics; *Student Evaluation; *Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

Initial certification programs specify expectations or experiences of their teacher candidates both before and after admission. Typical prerequisites to admission include academic program, test scores, course work, or assessment of professional performance. Criteria for retention after admission often consist of academic performance or mastery of competencies. This paper addresses criteria that are most commonly recognized as subjective, nonacademic expectations. A survey of 58 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education member institutions was piloted to determine the reasons an institution would counsel a student to drop out of the education program. The survey identified 19 nonacademic items representing personal, behavioral, physical, and legal issues or situations reported to be related to "counseling out." Schools reported whether or not an item was assessed in their program as well as whether it was considered before or after admission. Among the top five rankings were physical exceptionalities and grooming. Behavioral and legal conditions ranked in the middle among the schools. Personal circumstances constituted the final items in all schools. Appendices include the survey instrument and tables displaying some of the data. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317541

Non-Academic Criteria:
Accountability in Pre-Service Teacher Education

Sharon Pray Muir and Susan C. Leslie

Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan 48309-4401

Running Head: Non-academic Criteria

Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Chicago, Illinois

February, 1990

SP032 223

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. P. Muir

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Non-academic Criteria:
Accountability in Pre-Service Teacher Education

Initial certification programs specify expectations or experiences of their teacher candidates both before and after admission. Typical prerequisites to admission include academic progress (grades or grade point average), test scores, course work, or assessment of professional performance in clinical settings. Criteria for retention after admission often consist of academic performance in classes or mastery of competencies. Academic performance as reflected by grades usually is considered by students and faculty to be objective, presumably because it is quanitifiable. While the effect of subjective judgments in reaching a quantitative grade is infrequently questioned, this paper addresses criteria that are most commonly recognized as subjective--non-academic expectations. The qualitative nature of non-academic issues subjects those criteria to scrutiny and to criticism.

Important dimensions of effectiveness as a professional educator do not lend themselves to formal, quantitative evaluation. Circumstances other than academic progress affect a student's potential in the quest to become a professional educator. Personal, behavioral, physical and legal factors can enhance or impede one's success in a teacher education program. College catalogs, program criteria and course syllabi rarely include non-academic criteria among admission or completion requirements. When they exist, they are used less often than academic criteria as reasons for withholding certification.

Curiously, little attention has been given to non-academic criteria in the published literature. The earliest reference seems to be Haberman's 1972 caution about limiting admission decisions to criteria that "merely predict students' future success as students and do not predict teaching success" (p. 18). However, the guideline that he suggested was quasi-academic, that is the assessment of "the potential of candidates to function as continuous learners. . .[who would be] as susceptible as possible to future growth" (p. 19). In 1980, the College Board promoted a similar case urging general university admissions to assess personal qualities, especially the predilection for life-long learning (Willingham). Neither Haberman nor the College Board spoke to the non-academic qualities identified in the this study.

Not until the mid-1980s did NCATE standards explicitly address non-academic concerns. That reference was restricted to psychological tests, which were suggested as "optional" admission criteria (NCATE, 1985). Only one empirical study was found that has investigated the relationship between teaching success and four non-academic characteristics: attitudes toward teaching, moral reasoning, conceptual level, and ego development (McNergney & Satterstrom, 1984). While the study also looked at other criteria as well,[1] the only trait that proved significant was ego development ($p = < .05$), a finding consistent with research on general occupational success.

Two published surveys were located that deal with non-academic criteria; both addressed behavioral traits. Haberman reported in 1972 that 3% of 386 surveyed teacher education institutions used full-scale personality inventories in

---

[1] Academic variables were age, prior student teaching experience, and scholastic aptitude.

the selection procedure. By two decades later, Kapel, Gerber, and Reiff (1988) found 4% of institutions in their study used any of the following standard instruments: California Psychology Index [sic], Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Thurston Temperment Scale, and the Adjective Self Description. Their study of 103 NCATE and 55 non-NCATE institutions contended that psychological and social-emotional fitness have been neglected in the national debate on teacher preparation. The survey investigated admissions criteria and procedures for assessing those traits as well as intervention, exit, and re-entry practices. Approximately 38% of both NCATE and non-NCATE institutions considered psychological or social-emotional fitness in the teacher education program. In fact, state teacher certification statutes rarely addressed psychological (n = 20) or social-emotional (n = 23) fitness; even fewer required "evidence" of fitness. No state required maladjustment problems to be reported for in-service teachers except in one state, in the case when a teacher pursues additional certificates. Non-testing assessment was the dominant method of identification, relying primarily on formal observation. Pre- and post-admission intervention procedures for students identified with psychological, social or emotional problems most often were referred to faculty committees or health services. "Elimination from the admission process was. . .a low option" (p. 228), but non-NCATE institutions more frequently required psychological evaluations when a problem was identified after admission. Readmission was rarely granted to students who had been dismissed for psychological or social-emotional reasons after formal entry to a program.

The authors' experiences have been that when unusual situations arise, teacher educators report in vague terms that students were "counseled out" of the program. Is "counseling out" an effective or responsible procedure? Teacher educators could be expected to criticize schools if they merely identified a pupil's non-academic problem but failed to treat it, particularly if it could affect the pupil's learning potential. Does teacher education have an obligation to provide assistance, especially to students who are admitted to a program? If a program is unable to detect a problem area prior to admission, does it have a responsibility that exceeds "counseling out"? Unacceptable behaviors by pre-service candidates are likely to limit their success in other professions as well. Some would argue that effective programs should work directly and systematically with students when unacceptable traits are identified. Moreover, responsible educators can provide meaningful support systems either to modify the behavior or to adjust the situation in a way that the student's potential is enhanced--even when correction is insufficient to predict success in teaching. Finally, what does a program do if the student who is "counseled out" fails to do so?

While the ethics of such questions need to be explored further, the sparse literature led the authors to survey schools in order to assess the current situation.

Method

A survey instrument (Appendix A) was piloted to determine 1) which non-academic issues are assessed, 2) when assessment is made, 3) the procedure used to identify those issues, and 4) the potential effect that non-academic problems have on the candidate's pursuit of certification. A final item inquired if formal policies have been reviewed by legal counsel.

Representative random sampling was used to select 101, or 15%, of 1988 AACTE-member institutions representing both public and private schools in all

50 states and the federal district. After a second mailing to non-responding institutions, 58 replies (57%) were received. One private institution returned the questionnaire but did not complete it on advice of legal counsel. Responses represented 36 states; all surveyed institutions responded from 20 states (see Appendix B). Among sampled schools, 57% were public and 43% private; responses were received from 63% of public and 37% of private institutions. The sample size does not meet power requirements to justify generalization beyond the respondents.[1] The widely acknowledged relationship between school type and size is evident in the following enrollment data:

	Range	Mean
Public	3,000–40,000	13,458
Private	500–15,000	3,160

Criteria Assessed

The survey identified 19 non-academic items representing personal, behavioral, physical, and legal issues or situations that are reported in the literature to be related to teaching success (see Table 1). No terms were defined and no respondent reported a problem even though interpretations can vary.

Table 1

Non-academic Traits

Personal	Physical
Family stress or crisis	General health
Financial instability	Grooming, cleanliness, hygiene
Significant personal loss	Medication effects
	Physical exceptionality
Behavioral	
Abnormal personality behavior	
Ethical conduct	
Improper sexual behavior	**Legal**
Interpersonal relationships	
Multicultural insensitivity	Alcohol abuse
Nervousness before groups	Felony convictions
Organizational ability	Illegal drug abuse
Professional tardiness	Misdemeanor convictions

Respondents suggested four additional issues, but provided insufficient explanation to ensure correct classification or interpretation. All were behavioral. For the purposes of the survey, "impatience" was classified as a "difficulty in interpersonal relationships" and "rigidity in organizing personal life" was classified

[1] A sample of nearly 250 AACTE-member institutions would be needed to detect differences at the 95 percent level of confidence among the 1988 membership (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

with "organizational ability." We recommend that a revised list include the following two suggestions; neither was tallied in the survey:

Intolerance, including multicultural insensitivity
Rigidity in thinking

Schools reported if an item was assessed in their program as well as when it was considered, either before or after admission. Table 2 reports the 20 concerns ranked by frequency of total occurrence; it also distinguishes responses from public and private institutions.

Table 2

Frequency of Occurrence of Assessed Non-Academic Issues

In Percentages, Multiple Responses Possible

N = 58 (n = 37 public, 21 private)

	Total	Pub	Pri
Physical exceptionality	81	*89	66
Interpersonal relationships	69	65	76
Nervousness before groups	69	62	81
Felony convictions	66	65	66
Grooming, cleanliness, hygiene	62	65	57
Professional tardiness	62	54	76
Multicultural insensitivity	60	59	62
Abnormal personality behavior	59	54	66
Ethical conduct	59	49	*76
Organizational ability	59	49	*76
Illegal drug use	51	46	62
Alcohol abuse	45	43	48
General health	45	41	52
Misdemeanor convictions	41	38	48
Improper sexual behavior	38	32	48
Medication effects	31	27	38
Family stress or crisis	29	27	33
Significant personal loss	28	24	33
Financial instability	21	16	29

* Chi-square significance among raw data, $p < .05$

Among all schools, two physical conditions--physical exceptionalities and grooming--were among the top five rankings, while the remaining two conditions in that category--general health and medication effects--ranked among the bottom seven concerns. Behavioral and legal conditions ranked in the middle among all schools. Greater attention was given to felony convictions in general than to specific legal infractions, such as substance abuse. All three personal circum-

stances--family crisis, significant loss, and financial instability--constituted the final three items by all schools.

Overall, non-academic issues were addressed more often by private (X = 10.5) than by public institutions (X = 9.1). Three significant differences emerged between public and private schools. Public institutions were more concerned with physical exceptionalities than were private schools while private schools gave more attention to ethical conduct and organizational ability than did their public counterparts.

The interval when conditions are assessed varies among institutions (see Table 3). Some are evaluated only before admission, others both before and after admission, and still others are evaluated only after admission. Eight circumstances were assessed at notably different intervals. Only one tends to be evaluated exclusively before admission--physical exceptionality. It is assessed more by public than private schools, but was not considered at all by nearly 20% of respondents. Ten traits, six of which are behavioral, tend to be assessed only after program admission. The six behaviors were assessed exclusively after program admission by 40% or more of all schools: interpersonal relationships, nervousness, tardiness, multicultural insensitivity, ethical conduct, and organizational ability.

Procedures for Identifying Issues

For each non-academic issue, respondents indicated which of five identification procedures is used. Summary results appear in Table 4; Appendix C reports the relationship between circumstances and procedures. Some respondents listed tests as "other" documentation. Those responses were classified as formal documentation. One respondent indicated that some non-academic issues constituted admission criteria, but failed to identify the procedure used for making that assessment. Other suggested procedures that were not incorporated in the survey were: 1) handled in required pre-professional course(s); 2) considered by admission committees; 3) considered by a teacher education council; 4) assessed by a referral agency (e.g., an office for disabled students); 5) references supplied by students; 6) recommendation forms; and 7) student-signed affidavits of fitness. Those suggestions were not tallied in the survey, but we recommend that future surveys of this type incorporate them by adding the following three procedures:

Faculty recommendations
Non-faculty recommendations
Self-reporting by applicant/candidate

Only four schools (7%) reported no attempt to assess non-academic matters; all were public institutions. A preponderance (two-thirds or more) of schools rely on informal reporting of concerns initiated either by faculty or school personnel. Almost half of the institutions have a formal procedure for identifying non-academic concerns. Regular faculty meetings to discuss non-academic concerns are held by only 10% of the schools, 4 public and 2 private institutions. Comparison of institutional type found that private schools took into account a greater number of issues only before admission to a program than did public institutions, though no statistically significant differences were identified.

Only seven schools that use formal, documented procedures have reviewed those procedures with legal counsel; six were public institutions. Conditions most

Table 3

Interval When Non-Academic Issues Are Assessed

In Percentages, Ranked as in Table 2

N = 58 (n = 37 public, 21 private)

	INTERVAL											
	Before-only			Before & After			After-only			Not Assessed		
	Total	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri	Total	Pub	Pri
Physical exceptionality	45	49	38	19	22	14	17	19	14	19	11	33
Interpersonal relationships	9	3	19	22	16	33	40	49	24	31	35	24
Nervousness before groups	17	19	14	14	8	24	36	32	43	31	38	19
Felony convictions	28	24	29	22	19	29	17	22	10	34	35	33
Grooming, cleanliness or hygiene	19	22	14	19	16	24	24	27	19	40	35	43
Professional tardiness	7	3	14	12	8	19	41	41	43	38	46	24
Multicultural insensitivity	3	5	0	14	8	24	43	46	38	40	41	38
Abnormal personality behavior	9	3	19	21	16	29	29	35	19	41	46	33
Ethical conduct	5	3	10	14	3	33	40	43	33	41	51	24
Organizational ability	7	5	10	14	8	24	38	35	43	41	51	24
Illegal drug use	10	5	19	16	14	19	26	27	24	48	54	38
Alcohol abuse	9	5	14	9	8	10	28	30	24	55	57	52
General health	19	14	29	7	3	14	19	24	10	57	59	48
Misdemeanor convictions	9	5	14	16	11	24	17	22	10	59	62	52
Improper sexual behavior	5	5	5	17	14	24	16	14	19	62	68	52
Medication effects	3	3	5	7	8	5	21	16	29	69	73	62
Family stress or crisis	0	0	0	7	8	5	22	19	29	71	73	67
Significant personal loss	2	3	0	5	5	5	20	14	29	71	76	67
Financial instability	7	3	14	3	5	0	10	8	14	79	84	71

Table 4

Procedures for Identifying Non-academic Concerns

In Percentages; Multiple Responses Possible

N = 58 (n = 37 public, 21 private)

Total	School Type Public	Private	Procedure
78	76	81	University personnel informally bring matter to attention of others
62	65	57	School district personnel informally bring matter to attention of others
45	51	33	Formal, documented procedure exists
10	7	9	Regular faculty meetings are held to discuss non-academic concerns
14	11	19	Other procedures
7	7	0	Non-academic conditions are not assessed

associated with formal procedures (see Appendix C) were felony convictions (13 instances), physical exceptionality (12), drug abuse (8), alcohol abuse (7), abnormal personality behavior (7), and misdemeanor convictions (7). The school that uses self-reporting as an identification procedure uses it to assess moral fitness and criminal history.

Documented Procedures. Seven of the 26 schools that have formal procedures responded to a request to return policies, procedures or materials with the survey. Those procedures can be classified into one of the following types; institutions are identified with their permission:

• Several schools make use of written referrals similar to the one submitted by Cleveland State University (Appendix E). While its scope does not incorporate all categories of this survey, it was the most comprehensive form of its type. Some schools indicated that a special committee meets whenever a predetermined number of referrals accumulates for an individual student. The authors' home institution uses a similar procedure in which referrals may be initiated not only by faculty, school personnel, or advisors but also by fellow students.

• Some schools have policies or procedures that are specific to issue, such as Murray (KY) State University's policy for Students with Learning Disabilities or Other Handicapping Conditions.

• Procedures in some programs are continuous, or formative. A type of formative assessment is used at Berea (KY) College, for instance. Four checklists

aid students in the process of self-evaluation, beginning with admission to the program and concluding with application to student teaching. Additional checklists are specific to the level of certification sought--early elementary, upper elementary or secondary.

• An assessment used at the University of Wisconsin--Stout, is completed by students prior to field placements, including student teaching. The questionnaire asks students to respond (yes/no) to questions about prior withdrawals from field placements, denial or revocation of licensure in other states, disciplinary actions at any college or university, felony and misdemeanor charges or convictions, and physical or mental conditions that might adversely affect their performance of responsibilities.

• University policies and procedures embrace behaviors and concerns specific to teacher education on some campuses. At the University of Delaware, a Student Guide to Policies details its Undergraduate Student Judicial System, including both a Council on Student Judicial Affairs and an Appellate Court. The scope of conduct includes many of the issues addressed in this paper, such as alcohol abuse, felony arrests, and ethical issues involving sexual harrassment and academic dishonesty. It is conceivable that issues unique to professional programs could be raised in that forum, though timely response may be jeopardized.

Faculty Meetings. While none of the surveyed institutions detailed procedures for faculty meetings to address non-academic issues, the authors are familiar with the process at several schools. In all cases, the practice has been confined to elementary education programs. In general, one or more regularly scheduled meetings is held each semester exclusively for that purpose. Some schools go through the entire list of active students; others allow each faculty member to raise the name of only those students about whom there is a concern. The procedure generally takes the pattern of a staff meeting, often held for special education pupils in elementary and secondary schools. By clearly establishing the meeting's purpose, maintaining a professional tone, keeping matters confidential, and following up with a course of action, preconceived expectations are avoided among faculty whom students have not yet worked. The major benefits of regular meetings are that faculty can easily express their concerns and group consensus can be reached. Whereas two or three semesters may have passed before written referrals accumulate, regular meetings identify and address problems more quickly. The policy and procedures used at Oakland University appear in Appendix E.

Program Response to Non-academic Issues

The study also sought to determine how programs handle non-academic situations after they are identified. Five possible actions were included in the survey ranging from "no action" to "denial of certification." Summary data appear in Table 5; Appendix F reports the relationship between each issue and program response. Four additional actions suggested by respondents could be added to future surveys:

Program admission denied
Student enrollment restricted until improvement is demonstrated
Field placement assignment is changed
Referral to the state certification agency

Table 5

Actions Involving Non-academic Concerns

In Percentages; Multiple Responses Possible

N = 58 (n = 37 public, 21 private)

Total	Public	Private	Treatment
72	84	52	Professional diagnosis, counseling or assistance is urged
57	43	*81	Informal advice to discontinue program
48	46	57	Professional diagnosis, counseling or assistance is required
40	38	*43	Initial certification is withheld
21	19	24	Other actions
9	5	14	No action

* Chi-square significance among raw data, $p < .05$

The most common practices are informal, or advisory. Students are urged to seek professional diagnosis. Informal advice to discontinue a teacher education program, while common, is more frequently given by private schools. Approximately one-half of schools are more assertive, either requiring professional diagnosis or withholding certification. Private schools in this survey were considerably more likely to withhold certification than were public schools.

Multiple approaches are associated with each circumstance (see Appendix F), though there is a greater relationship in some cases. Informal advice to seek professional assistance is given more to students with physical exceptionalities and with problems involving interpersonal relationships. Advice to withdraw from a program occurs more when problems involve abnormal personality behavior, improper sexual behavior and ethical conduct. Formal diagnosis is required most for alcohol abuse and abnormal personality behavior whereas certification is denied primarily for felony convictions. Two issues--ethical conduct and improper sexual behavior--tend to be addressed by urging the candidate either to seek professional assistance or to withdraw from the program. Only seven schools reported that they withhold certification for ethical or sexual misconduct. As expected, felony convictions, more than any other issue, constitute reason to deny certification (n = 15). Another ten schools merely urge convicted felons to seek professional advice. That unexpected finding may be due to the variation in felony definitions among states.[1]

[1] Some felony convictions in one state are misdemeanors in others, such as possession of given quantities of cannibis or an accumulated number of driving-under-intoxication convictions.

Discussion

While the survey sample was small and the return rate was disappointing, we venture to raise several matters emerging from these data for further consideration. The first six relate to specific non-academic criteria.

Physical exceptionality. Federal law limits the extent to which physical exceptionalities may impact admissions and retention decisions. Legal advice at our institution is that physical exceptionality may not be assessed for program admission, since it could limit a student's pursuit of a baccalaureate degree. After a student is admitted, however, certification could be withheld if the exceptionality prevented the student from fulfilling professional responsibilities. Whether or not a Supreme Court ruling that allowed a nursing program to deny admission to a blind applicant would extend to teacher education is unclear, especially since instances are documented of individuals with a variety of physical handicaps succeeding in teaching. In light of public law, we did not expect, to find that 45% of responding institutions assess physical exceptionality only before program admission.

Criminal behavior. The fear that a teacher candidate will commit a crime while in the university program is shared by many schools. Sexual behaviors and drug dealing are foremost among those fears. It is becoming increasingly difficult for institutions to obtain information about criminal conduct. One school reported that state law currently prohibits seeking information about drug abuse, abnormal personality behavior, improper sexual behavior or felony convictions. In most states, students must volunteer access to their criminal records even if "reasonable suspicion" exists. Courts have become more lenient toward offenders, often expunging convictions from records if individuals participate in counseling or support group programs. A local attorney recently recommended that our teacher education program require applicants to sign a criminal record release waiver, primarily to deter criminals or potential offenders from pursuing a teaching career.

Substance abuse. Schools that report assessing substance abuse do devote greater attention to drugs than to alcohol. That finding is puzzling,[1] when compared to substance abuse data for levels that impair social and occupational functioning (APA, 1987). Statistics are difficult to analyze since abusers often use multiple drugs and data are reported separately for each type. It seems, however, that alcohol abuse afflicts about 13% of Americans and is about three times more prevalent than drug abuse. Substance abuse generally is greater among males than females. Incidence in professional programs may be expected to be lower than national figures, since impaired function affects general college success before they begin professional courses. An unusual discrepancy remains, however, when three times as many people abuse alcohol, yet slightly more sampled schools assess drug abuse as assess alcohol abuse. Of greater concern is the fact that large numbers of schools reported no attempt to assess substance abuse, alcohol or drugs, at all.

Ethics. It is assumed that some unethical conduct, such as cheating on a test, is treated as an academic misconduct, or quasi-legal, matter at most schools. But, it also is possible that other situations are overlooked, especially behaviors that are legal but unethical. Little attention has been devoted in published literature to

---

[1] The possibility that institutions considered alcohol abuse to be a subset of drug abuse, is unlikely since alcohol and drug abuse were listed separately on the survey.

ethics in teacher education. Multicultural insensitivity could be considered an ethical matter, yet large numbers of schools reported no attempt to assess it. Other examples could include sexual involvement with majority-age pupils or pressuring pupils or their parents to purchase products or services that financially benefit the teacher candidate. Twice as many private as public surveyed institutions assessed ethical conduct. While many private institutions have religious affiliations, one would hope that public institutions are equally concerned with ethics. Yet, only 60% of responding schools reported any attempt to assess that type of behavior. A study of the codes of ethics among professional organizations, such as the National Education Association or its state affiliates, may be warranted in order to elaborate ethics that are relevant to teacher education.

Organizational ability. Organizational ability is a criterion that distinguished private from public schools in this survey. At least one study has found that people who stay in teaching have better organizational skills, particularly in organization of time (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982). Given the variety of tasks, number of pupils, and expectation to "be flexible" that confront a teacher, both programs and research studies may do well to devote more attention to this skill.

Personal circumstances. Haberman (1974) noted that teacher education programs emphasize humane concerns toward children. Are humane concerns also extended to teacher education candidates? The three personal issues in the survey (i.e., family stress or crisis, financial instability, and significant personal loss) were the lowest ranked non-academic issues. They were reported as concerns by fewer than one-third of schools; only one-fifth addressed financial instability.

In all likelihood, support services provide personal or financial counseling to university students. Those services, however, do not necessarily address the impact on a student's program of study. Counseling services and financial aid may be available, but a candidate's teaching potential may not be reached unless students can benefit from those services. Moreover, some students ultimately improve their performance by taking incompletes or temporarily withdrawing from the program in order to adjust to a divorce or to care for a terminally ill relative. Until that realistic solution is suggested by a caring professor, the student's anxiety may be heightened by possible loss of tuition. In the throes of stressful personal circumstances, solutions raised by faculty and staff may not have occurred to the college student. Students today are faced with staggering personal problems. We have found that subjective judgments about a student's marginal performance are often related to an underlying personal problem. The nature of the situation, however, was unknown until someone ventured to probe.

In addition to these criteria, four additional issues deserve elaboration.

Influence of potential litigation. Grades and test scores are less subject to legal challenge than most subjective criteria. We believe that many schools rely on academic criteria to avoid potential litigation. That relatively few schools have formal procedures for dealing with non-academic issues is unexpected. In most cases reported in this study, formal procedures exist only for issues that have "hard" supporting evidence, such as test scores, physical examinations or legal records. Moreover, few schools have reviewed formal procedures with legal counsel.

School size. Data on school size have not been fully analyzed, since no attempt was made to distinguish between size of program and size of institution. But small schools devoted attention to a greater number of non-academic criteria than did larger schools. In particular, private schools considered more non-academic issues only prior to admission to a program than did public schools, leading us to infer that private, or small, schools get to know candidates better before admission decisions are made. This would be in keeping with Boyer's (1987) observations about the relationship between school size and personal attention to college students. Few would argue that faculty get to know better students with whom they work for sustained periods of time or in small groups. Within large schools, non-academic assessment might be enhanced if students were admitted to cohort groups that work together throughout a program. Admission could also be to a single program block taught by a small group of professors. Another option would be to assign a faculty member to a group of students to function much as a homeroom teacher does in many secondary schools.

Standard Assessment. Standard instruments have been validated that measure behavioral traits. The tests that are briefly described below have been used in research involving teachers or teaching candidates. For most tests, citations are provided both to the instrument and to one teaching-related study using each device.

- The California Psychological Inventory assesses positive personality traits, such as ego strength, friendliness and acceptance of traditional authority (Gough, Durflinger & Hill, 1968).

- Rest's (1974) Defining Issues Test measures moral reasoning as described by Kohlberg's six-stage theory (McNergney & Satterstrom, 1984).

- Constantinople (1967) designed an instrument that evaluates ego development based on Erikson's stages 4, 5 and 6 (McNergney & Satterstrom, 1984).

- The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Graham, 1977) seeks to objectively assess personality maladjustments, neuroticism and anxiety (Gough, Durflinger & Hill, 1968).

- The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) measures attitudes towards pupils and teaching, including characteristics, such as the ability to win student affection, maintain discipline and understand children (McNergney & Satterstrom, 1984).

- A paragraph completion device, developed by Hunt, Butler, Noy and Rossner (1977), assesses cognitive complexity and interpersonal maturity (McNergney & Satterstrom, 1984).

- Cattell & Eber's (1957) Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire measures personality traits such as conscientiousness, control and practicality (Mundel-Atherstone, 1980).

Performance of these measures varies widely, as do the subjects among the cited studies. In general, none has been found that predicts professional performance in teaching or in other occupations. Haberman (1972) expressed his

opinion of the MTAI, for instance as "a superficial attitude survey which can be correlated with anything but predictive of nothing" (p. 15). However, we also wish to make three points: 1) As poorly as standard instruments perform, they are no worse than many other widely used selection procedures, including personal interviews, grades and biographical data (Pratt, 1984). 2) To our knowledge, all of the above instruments have been used with groups of subjects. Formal instruments may offer diagnostic options when concerns arise about an individual teacher candidate. 3) The above instruments also have been used in isolation from each other. While we are skeptical that useful combinations will be found, assessment, for instance, of both moral reasoning and cognitive complexity might together prove useful.

Formative Assessment. It is understandable that many characteristics are not assessed until after students are admitted to a program. Most traits are best evaluated when faculty have the opportunity to directly observe and interact with students. But limiting assessment of some traits to pre-admission only, as did 19% of schools surveyed, seems unusual. Conditions change over time. Formative assessment that is on-going and that includes both academic and non-academic characteristics would seem to benefit both the teacher candidate and the program.

Conclusion

Admission and completion of teacher education programs continue to emphasize grades and certification tests, which are "inexpensive [and] efficient" (Haberman, 1974, p. 235). Sizeable numbers of responding institutions fail to assess many of these non-academic issues. Excluding physical exceptionalities, from 30% to 70% of schools disregarded each of the remaining 18 traits. We believe that programs have an obligation to do more than merely "counsel out" marginal students who are too often described as having "fallen through the cracks" of seemingly adequate screening procedures. Indeed, the success of teacher education programs and the future of American education rest on fostering success among potential teachers, whether they go on to teach or not.

References

American Psychiatric Association (APA). (1987). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed., rev.). Washington, DC: Author.

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Cattel, R. B., & Eber, H. W. (1957). Handbook for the sixteen personality factor questionnaire. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Chapman, D. W., & Hutcheson, S. M. (1982). Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 93-105.

Constantinople, A. (1967). Perceived instrumentality of the college as a measure of attitude toward college. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 196-201.

Gough, H. G., Durflinger, G. W., & Hill, R. E. (1968). Predicting performance in student teaching from the California Psychological Inventory. Journal of Educational Psychology, 59(2), 115-122.

Haberman, M. (1972). Guidelines for the selection of students into programs of teacher education (ATE Research Bulletin 11). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators/ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 063 247)

Haberman, M. (1974). Needed: New guidelines for teacher candidate selection. Journal of Teacher Education, 25, 234-235.

Hunt, D. E., Butler, L. F., Noy, J. E. & Rosser, M. E. (1977). Assessing conceptual level by the paragraph completion method. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Kapel, D. E., Gerber, P., & Reiff, H. B. (1988). Psychological and social-emotional fitness for teacher education students: A national survey of current practices. The College Student Journal, 22, 216-229.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.

McNergney, R., & Satterstrom, L. (1984). Teacher characteristics and teacher performance. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 9, 19-24.

Mundel-Atherstone, B. J. (1980). A personality profile of students who are successful in student teaching and in teaching. Lethbridge, Alberta: The University of Lethbridge. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 191 827)

NCATE redesigned standards. (1985). Washington, DC: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Office of Educational Research & Improvement (OERI). (1988). Youth indicators. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, U. S. Government Printing Office.

Pratt, D. (1984). Predicting career success in teaching. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 273 603)

Rest, J. R. (1974). Manual for the defining issues test: An objective test of moral judgment. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis.

Willingham, W. W. The case for personal qualities in admissions. (1980). The College Board Review, 116, A1-A7.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

NON-ACADEMIC ADMISSIONS, RETENTION & COMPLETION REQUIREMENTS in Teacher Education Programs Leading to Initial Certification

Your cooperation is requested in completing this survey of a sample of AACTE-member institutions. Results will be reported in early 1990. Please complete and return the instrument by October 27, 1989.

1. Mark any of the following non-academic conditions or situations that are assessed before or after a student is admitted to your initial teacher education certification program(s). Place an **X** in the column(s) that identifies when a suspected or known circumstance is considered.

		Before	During
a.	family stress or crises	___	___
b.	financial instability	___	___
c.	significant personal loss (divorce, death)	___	___
d.	physical exceptionality (speech, hearing, visual or motor)	___	___
e.	grooming, cleanliness or hygiene	___	___
f.	general health	___	___
g.	medication affects	___	___
h.	illegal drug abuse	___	___
i.	alcohol abuse	___	___
j.	interpersonal relationships	___	___
k.	abnormal personality behavior	___	___
l.	improper sexual behavior	___	___
m.	misdemeanor convictions	___	___
n.	felony convictions	___	___
o.	organizational ability	___	___
p.	nervousness before groups ("stage fright")	___	___
q.	professional tardiness	___	___
r.	ethical conduct	___	___
s.	multicultural insensitivity (racial, ethnic, gender, religious, or socioeconomic)	___	___
t.	other (specify)		
	_____	___	___
	_____	___	___

2. Mark all statements that describe your program's procedure for identifying or considering non-academic concerns and situations. If one or more approaches apply to all of the above circumstances, write **All** on the line(s) to the right. If an approach applies only to some of the above circumstances, write the letter(s) that correspond with the circumstance cited in Item 1 to the right of the statement. (Example: If students who are suspected of alcohol abuse are identified or considered at regular faculty meetings held

for the purpose of discussing non-academic concerns, place an **X** before item b below and write **j** on the line to the right since **j** corresponds with alcohol abuse in Item 1.)

		Circumstance(s)
____	a. Non-academic conditions are not assessed.	_____
____	b. A faculty member or adviser informally brings the situation to the attention of the program director or other faculty.	_____
____	c. School district personnel informally bring the situation to the attention of the program director or other faculty.	_____
____	d. Regular faculty meetings are held for the purpose of airing non-academic concerns.	_____
____	e. A formal documented procedure exists.	
____	f. Other (explain) _____	_____
	_____	_____

3. Mark the statement(s) with an **X** that best describe(s) your program's procedure for dealing with or treating non-academic conditions and situations. As in Item 2, either write **All** or the letter of the applicable circumstance.

		Circumstance(s)
____	a. No action is taken.	_____
____	b. The student is urged to obtain formal diagnosis, counseling, or assistance from a professional.	_____
____	c. The student is required to obtain formal diagnosis, counseling, or assistance from a professional in order to continue in the program.	_____
____	d. The student is advised informally to discontinue the initial certification program.	_____
____	e. The student is denied initial certification.	_____
____	f. Other (explain) _____	
	_____	_____

4. If your program has a formal policy or procedure that addresses non-academic situations or conditions, please return a copy with this survey. Has the policy or procedure been reviewed and approved by legal counsel? ☐ yes ☐ no

Demographic information:

☐ Public institution
☐ Private institution

Approximate total institution enrollment _____

U.S. State _____

If you would like to receive a summary of survey results, write your address below:

_____

If further information on the survey is needed, contact Susan Leslie or Sharon Muir, Curriculum, Instruction & Leadership, Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48309-4401 (313/370-3070).

Refold and staple or tape so postage return section is visible

Appendix B

Distribution of Schools Surveyed and Responding

By state and type

N = 58

	Surveyed		Responding	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
Alabama	1	2	0	0
• Alaska	1	0	1	–
Arizona	1	0	0	–
Arkansas	1	1	1	0
California	1	1	0	1
• Colorado	1	1	1	1
Connecticut	1	0	0	–
• Delaware	1	0	1	–
• District of Columbia	0	1	–	1
Florida	1	1	0	1
• Georgia	1	1	1	1
Hawaii	1	0	0	–
• Idaho	1	0	1	–
Illinois	1	2	1	0
• Indiana	1	2	1	2
• Iowa	2	1	2	1
Kansas	1	1	1	0
• Kentucky	1	1	1	1
Louisiana	1	1	1	0
Maine	1	0	0	–
Maryland	1	1	1	0
Massachusetts	1	1	0	0
• Michigan	2	1	2	1
Minnesota	1	2	1	1
Mississippi	1	1	0	0
Missouri	1	2	1	1
Montana	1	0	1	–
• Nebraska	1	1	1	1
• Nevada	1	0	1	–
• New Hampshire	1	0	1	–
New Jersey	1	1	1	0
New Mexico	1	0	0	–
New York	1	3	0	1
North Carolina	1	1	0	1
North Dakota	1	0	0	–
Ohio	2	2	1	2
• Oklahoma	1	1	1	1
• Oregon	1	0	1	–
Pennsylvania	2	2	1	0
• Rhode Island	1	0	1	–
South Carolina	1	1	0	1
South Dakota	1	0	0	–
Tennessee	2	1	1	0
Texas	2	3	2	0
• Utah	1	0	0	–
Vermont	1	0	0	–
Virginia	1	1	0	0
• Washington	1	1	1	1
• West Virginia	1	1	1	1
Wisconsin	3	1	3	0
• Wyoming	1	0	1	0
Total	58	43	37	21
	101		58	

• All surveyed institutions responded in these states.

Appendix C

Relationship between Non-academic Concern and Identification Procedure

In Percentages; Ranked as in Table 2

N = 58

Concern	Procedure[1]					
	Informal		Formal	Regular		No
	Faculty	School	Procedure	Meetings	Other	Assess
Physical exceptionality	52	36	21	9	3	3
Interpersonal relationships	55	45	7	7	3	3
Nervousness before groups	50	41	7	9	2	3
Felony convictions	38	28	22	7	3	3
Grooming, cleanliness, hygiene	55	43	7	9	3	5
Professional tardiness	50	47	9	9	3	3
Multicultural insensitivity	52	38	5	7	2	3
Abnormal personality behavior	48	38	12	7	2	3
Ethical conduct	52	43	10	9	3	5
Organizational ability	48	40	5	9	2	3
Illegal drug abuse	48	36	14	7	5	5
Alcohol abuse	48	36	12	9	5	5
General health	41	31	10	7	2	5
Misdemeanor convictions	40	28	12	7	2	5
Improper sexual behavior	48	34	10	7	3	5
Medication effects	47	33	7	7	2	5
Family stress or crisis	47	31	7	7	2	5
Significant personal loss	48	31	1	7	2	5
Financial instability	41	29	5	5	2	5
Total Institutional Responses	78	62	45	10	14	7

[1]Procedures as stated in survey instrument.
Faculty informally bring concern to program director or other faculty
School personnel informally bring concern to program director or other faculty
Formal documented procedure exists
Regular faculty meetings are held to air non-academic concerns
Other procedures (i e , faculty and non-faculty recommendations as well as self-reporting by student)
No assessment of non-academic conditions

Appendix D

Sample Documented Procedure

Undergraduate Concern Conference Record

College of Education
Office of Student Personnel Services

CSU Cleveland State University

Date of conference _____ Student _____ SS# _____

Initiator of conference _____ Telephone _____

Other faculty present _____ Address _____

I. Areas of Concern (Please circle appropriate areas and provide explanations/descriptions of behavior)

A. Language Skills
1 oral expression
2 written expression
3 reading skills
4 other

B. Professional Relationships
1 student-faculty
2 student-peer
3 student-pupil/client
4 student-field personnel
5 other

C. Professional Responsibilities/Ethics
1 meeting obligations
2 student advocacy
3 other

D. Professional Competency
1 knowledge
2 skills
3 clinical experience
4 other

Explanation/Description _____

II. Planning and Progress Chart (Please complete the first two columns. Retain the white copy for filing; the blue copy to the Office of Student Personnel Services, RT 1401. Give the yellow copy to the student.)

Objectives (including quarter in which each objective is to be met, if applicable)	***Faculty/Student Adviser signatures***	***Objective met***
1 _____	1 _____ (f)	1 _____
_____	_____ (s)	
_____	_____ (a)	
2 _____	2 _____	2 _____
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
3 _____	3 _____	3 _____
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

III. College Policies

A. This record is confidential to the faculty and staff associated with the College of Education and is distributed as follows:
white copy — faculty member initiating conference
blue copy — student file in Office of Student Personnel Services
yellow copy — student

B. The *Director of Student Personnel Services* attends conferences upon request.

C. Continued concerns of failure to meet objectives may result in:
1 Conference with the Department Chairperson
2 Course enrollment restrictions/exclusion
3 Participation restriction/exclusion
4 Recommendation for dismissal

white copy faculty
blue copy office of student personnel services
yellow copy student

Spring 1981 (rev. 3/83)

Appendix E

Faculty Staffing Meeting

Policy

The elementary education program faculty meet at least once each semester exclusively to consider non-academic concerns about students who are actively pursuing initial certification. The Department Chairperson convenes and conducts a meeting according to the procedures that follow.

Procedures

1. The meeting is scheduled at a time when as many program faculty as possible are not teaching.

2. The following individuals are invited to to attend the meeting or, in the event that they are unable to attend, to submit a concern in writing: faculty (part-time and full-time) from departments in the School of Human and Educational Services that deliver courses in the program; advisors from the SHES Advising Office; Director of Field Placements.

3. Participants are reminded that the purpose is to discuss non-academic rather academic issues. They are also reminded of the confidential nature of concerns to be discussed and are asked not to take notes, except when needed for follow-up conferences that they have consented to convene (see below).

4. The Department Chairperson maintains personal, confidential notes and retains information from individuals who hold follow-up conferences with students. Public minutes are not kept.

5. Faculty, staff and advisors list names of students about whom they have a concern. Initial attention is given to students whose names were volunteered by more than one faculty member.

6. After each student's circumstance is presented, the group arrives at consensus on whether or not action is needed. If a follow-up conference or referral is recommended, one or more full-time faculty members are identified to meet with the student and to report to the Department Chairperson on the meeting.

7. When several staff members have reported a similar concern, action may be recommended to the Dean of the School of Educational and Human Services that requires action on the part of a student in order to continue in the program.

8. The Department Chairperson brings personal, confidential notes to each subsequent meeting to consult if concerns about a student continue.

9. No records are entered in student files unless formal, required action is endorsed by the Dean.

Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

Appendix F

Relationship between Non-academic Concern and Program Action

In Percentages; Ranked as in Table 2

N = 58

Concern	Action[1]					
	Urge Diagnosis	Advise Withdraw	Formal-Required	Denied Cert	Other	None
Physical exceptionality	34	14	17	9	5	2
Interpersonal relationships	33	17	16	7	5	2
Nervousness before groups	28	14	12	7	2	2
Felony convictions	17	17	10	26	7	3
Grooming, cleanliness, hygiene	28	14	10	7	5	3
Professional tardiness	24	14	10	7	3	2
Multicultural insensitivity	26	16	12	7	3	2
Abnormal personality behavior	28	19	21	2	3	2
Ethical conduct	22	19	12	7	2	3
Organizational ability	26	14	9	7	3	2
Illegal drug abuse	28	16	17	10	3	3
Alcohol abuse	26	16	22	7	2	3
General health	26	12	10	7	2	5
Misdemeanor convictions	17	14	12	9	7	3
Improper sexual behavior	21	19	12	12	2	3
Medication effects	24	12	10	7	2	3
Family stress or crisis	28	12	9	7	2	7
Significant personal loss	26	12	10	7	3	5
Financial instability	21	12	9	5	3	5
Total Institutional Responses	72	57	48	40	21	9

[1] Actions as stated in survey instrument:
Informally urged to seek formal diagnosis, counseling or assistance from a professional
Informally advised to withdraw from initial certification program
Required to obtain formal diagnosis, counseling or assistance from a professional
Denied initial certification
Other responses (i.e., deny admission to program; hold on registration until the improvement is demonstrated; placement reassignment; and referral of decision to state certification agency)
No action is taken.